

State of Nevada
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Division of State Lands
901 S Stewart Street, Suite 5003
Carson City, NV 89701



Jim Gibbons
Governor

James R. Lawrence
Administrator

SUBJECT: Amendment No. 3 to Request for Qualifications No. "NDSL NORTH CANYON RFQ 11-01"
Questions/Answers received August 4, 2010

DATE OF AMENDMENT: August 13, 2010

DATE OF RFP RELEASE: July 13, 2010

DATE AND TIME OF OPENING: August 31, 2010 @ 2:00 p.m.

AGENCY CONTACT: Elizabeth Harrison, Water Quality Program Manager, NDSL

The following shall be a part of RFQ No. "NDSL NORTH CANYON RFQ 11-01". If a vendor has already returned a proposal and any of the information provided below changes that proposal, please submit the changes along with this amendment. You need not re-submit an entire proposal prior to the opening date and time.

Question #1	The Scope of Work calls for a design memorandum that selects the preferred alternative and the design of treatments for 5 recommended strategies. The design process follows in the scope sequence and "may include the development of multiple design alternatives for individual strategies." Are the design alternatives to be developed after selection of the preferred alternative in the design memorandum, or is the design memorandum intended to document the process of developing design alternatives?
-------------	--

Answer #1	The North Canyon Creek Restoration Project Phase I April 2010 Final Report documented the strategies selected by the NTRT for priority implementation. At the beginning of the design process, it may be determined that some minor alternatives should be developed (likely at a very conceptual level) for some strategies to evaluate possible alternative designs, their cost differences and/or their implementation benefits/constraints. It is intended that the Design Memorandum would document the alternatives developed (if any), the selected alternative and the reason the selected alternative was chosen.
Question #2	Scope of Work lists the NDWR permit application. Has any preliminary communications or coordination with NDWR already occurred regarding the feasibility of dam modifications or any special data needs for permit application?
Answer #2	Preliminary conversations with NDWR have been minimal. NDWR however has indicated their need to be involved to review and approve any modifications to the dam that are proposed. Records of past inspections are available in hard copy from the NDWR office. Involving NDWR early in the design process will be necessary.
Question #3	Some of the 'invitation to submit proposal' letters were circulated to firms that are not primarily civil engineering firms, although the RFQ indicates that NDSL is seeking proposals from civil engineering firms and a registered civil engineer and geomorphologist are both crucial minimum qualifications. Please clarify whether NDSL would prefer having a civil engineering firm as prime consultant.
Answer #3	There are no preferences as to which firm in each team is the lead consultant on this project. The minimal qualifications were lined out to indicate necessary qualifications for the team.
Question #4	4a. What does the Part I submission look like to demonstrate meeting the minimum qualifications outlined in the RFQ? Are there specific documents or forms NDSL will be looking for? Is there any specific formatting such as the SF 330 format?

	<p>4b. 2NDNATURE is applying with Nichols Consulting Engineers and River Run Consulting as an organized team, rather than a primary vendor with detached subcontractors; does the primary vendor need to completely satisfy the minimum requirements as an individual company or can the team collectively satisfy those requirements?</p> <p>4c. How does an applicant document having a Geomorphologist team member? Is NDSL looking for a registered geologist, specific job title/job description? Will previous professional experience be able to document this satisfaction as a geomorphologist team member in terms of this RFQ?</p> <p>4d. Is the primary vendor required to be a Nevada based, registered civil engineering firm?</p>
Answer #4	<p>4.a. There are no special forms or formats to document that the minimum qualifications requirements have been met.</p> <p>4.b. The team needs to completely satisfy the minimum requirements. It is not necessary that each consultant individually satisfy the minimum requirements.</p> <p>4.c. We are looking for an individual to be able to document previous professional experience working as a geomorphologist on stream restoration projects.</p> <p>4.d. Per NRS 625.520, the civil engineer performing work on this project is required to be licensed in the State of Nevada.</p>
Question #5	<p>The team applying in response to this RFQ (2NDNATURE, Nichols Consulting Engineers and River Run Consulting) has worked together in the past and capable of submitting references demonstrating our collective work experience together on previous projects. Will NDSL accept a minimum of 3 references documenting our work experience as a group or is NDSL looking for at least 3 references for each company?</p>
Answer #5	<p>We want to see individually how each of the consulting firms have performed. Therefore 3 references will be required for each consultant and sub-consultant. Additional references may be submitted to document your performance as a project team however.</p>

Question #6	The Submission Checklist (Section 9/page 23) and RFQ attachments state that the section/tab labeled “State Documents” are included in Part II-Technical Proposal, whereas Section 6.3 – Proposal Submission Requirements indicates that these requisite materials are to be submitted in Part I-Minimum Qualifications. Which Part of the proposal submission are the “State Documents” to be included?
Answer #6	Please submit the "State Documents" information under Part II of the Technical Proposal.
Question #7	Is it common for NDSL to receive a submitted RFQ that was produced by an RFQ in word format with the applicant’s answers inserted into the RFQ questions?
Answer #7	NDSL has completed very few RFPs/RFQs in the past several years. In the most recent RFP, none of the proposals submitted inserted their responses into the RFP document itself. However, it is acceptable, per Section 6.13 to submit a proposal in which responses are directly inserted into the RFQ. For a word version of the RFQ, please contact Liz Harrison at 775-684-2736. Regardless of the format used, all information should be provided in a clear and legible format that clearly responds to the RFQ requirements.
Question #8	Would the evaluation committee prefer any type of formatting in regards to submitted resumes, such as an SF 330 format?
Answer #8	There are no preferences on formatting type. All information should be provided in a clear and legible format that clearly responds to the RFQ requirements.

WITH EXCEPTION TO AMENDMENT #1 ,#2 and #3, ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFQ “NDSL NORTH CANYON RFQ 11-01”.

Vendor shall sign and return this amendment with the proposal submitted.

NAME OF VENDOR _____

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE _____

TITLE _____ DATE _____

RFQ “NDSL NORTH CANYON RFQ 11-01” Amendment 3

<p>This document must be submitted in the “State Documents” section/tab of vendors’ technical proposal</p>
--